



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/441,074	11/16/1999	SEISHI SUEHIRA	1075.1122/JD	3826
21171 759	90 04/01/2004		EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON			2177	
			DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004	\mathcal{L}

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

X

_	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\mathcal{X}
Advisory Action	09/441,074	SUEHIRA, SEISHI	4
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2177	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TO Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content of	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	·		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	·	,	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	,	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>Sec</u>		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· <i>, ,</i> —		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:GRETAROBINSON		Sathyanarayan Par	nnala

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Sato et al. (US Patent 6,014,680) anticipated the claims 9-12. For example, claim 9 limitation "the structured document being recorded in a data file formed on said recording medium" Sato teaches as the external repository for a variety of data to do keyword extraction at Fig. 38, col. 15, lines 9-10. Similarly claims 1-8 and 13-14 are rejected by combining Sato with Wanderski et al. (US Patent 6,519,617). For example, the limitation of claim 14, "a display displaying the structured document, wherein the structured document is an XML document" Wanderski teaches as the output of the DTD generation process is dynamically generated to desired XML tags.